

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO !	BE COMPLETED	BY PLANNING	STAFF		
ILENUMBER		<u> </u>	COUNCIL			
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN				
REZONING FILE	NUMBER	FLAN			BY	
	TO TO SEE SEE SEE		TED BY APPLI RINTOR TYPE)	CANT		
	ROPERTYBEING	YBR IAN	DRIVE	(A	MPBEL	L CA 9
ASSESSOR'S PA	RCELNUMBER(S)		412-41-1	117		
REASONOFPR	OTEST					
			1 t A			
Lorotoot the r	oronosed rezoning bec	ause See Attac	nment A			
I protest the p	oroposed rezoning bec	ause See Attac				
I protest the p	proposed rezoning bec	ause See Attac				
I protest the p	proposed rezoning bec	ause See Attac				
I protest the p	proposed rezoning bec					
		Use separate	sheet if necessary			
The property	in which Lown an undi	Use separate	sheet if necessary	behalf of wh		
The property	in which I own an undi	Use separate ivided interest of at by address and As	esheet if necessary least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of wh umber)	ich this protest	is being filed,
The property	in which I own an undi	Use separate ivided interest of at a address and Ass	least 51%, and on lessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of wh	ich this protest	is being filed,
The property	in which I own an undi : (describe property b AMBRIAN IMBE U	Use separate ivided interest of at by address and Ass	esheet if necessary least 51%, and on lessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of wh imber)	ich this protest	is being filed,
The property	in which I own an undi : (describe property b AMBRIAN IMBE U	Use separate ivided interest of at a address and Ass	esheet if necessary least 51%, and on lessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of wh imber)	ich this protest	is being filed,
The property is situated at CAN	in which I own an undi : (describe property b AMSRIAA 1RISE U 41;	Use separate ivided interest of at by address and Ass ORICE 95	e sheet if necessary least 51%, and on lesessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of wh Imber)	ich this protest	is being filed,
The property is situated at CAN	in which I own an undi : (describe property b AMBRIAN IMBE U	Use separate ivided interest of at by address and Ass ORICE 95	e sheet if necessary least 51%, and on lesessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of wh Imber)	ich this protest	is being filed,
The property is situated at 680 CA M	in which I own an undi : (describe property b AMSRIAA 1RISE U 41;	Use separate ivided interest of at by address and Ass	least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of wh imber) Santa Clai	ich this protest	is being filed,
The property is situated at	rin which I own an undi : (describe property b AMBRIAN IRISE U 41; zoned <u>R1</u> -8	Use separate ivided interest of at by address and Ass OR(()	least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of wh imber) Santa Clai	ich this protest	is being filed,
The property is situated at 680 CAN	rin which I own an undi : (describe property b AMBRIAN IRBE LL 41; zoned R1-8 ed interest which I own Fee Interest (ownership	Use separate ivided interest of at a separate of a separat	least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel Number of	behalf of wh imber) Santa Clai	ich this protest	is being filed,
The property is situated at 680 CAN	rin which I own an undi : (describe property b AMBRIAA ARJSELL zoned R1-8 ed interest which I own Fee Interest (ownership	Use separate ivided interest of at by address and Ass OR/(/C/2) 9 5 C/2 1 O C/2 O	least 51%, and on lessor's Parcel Number 1908 The District. (in Statement of the statement	behalf of wh imber) Santa Clar nent above i	ich this protest ra County)	is being filed,
The property is situated at 680 CAN	rin which I own an undi : (describe property b AMBRIAN IRBE LL 41; zoned R1-8 ed interest which I own Fee Interest (ownership	Use separate ivided interest of at by address and Ass OR/(/C/2) 9 5 C/2 1 O C/2 O	least 51%, and on lessor's Parcel Number 1908 The District. (in Statement of the statement	behalf of wh imber) Santa Clar nent above i	ich this protest ra County)	is being filed,

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME DURIAN (OOLAN		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408.7	96.7809
ADDRESS CAMBRIAN DRIVE	CAMP		TATE 9.	ZIPCODE
ADDRESS ADDRESS ASO CAMBRIAN DRIVE SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 9/	27/2010
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	;	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	.	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate:	sheet if necessar	у		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF SANTA CLAVA) ss.)
satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) what acknowledged to me that he/she/they exect	Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of mose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and uted the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and trument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
paragraph is true and correct.	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California
WITNESS my hand and official sea	Santa Clara County MyComm.ExpresMay22,2012 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF)) ss.)
	, Notary Public, personally appeared , who proved to me on the basis of nose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and
acknowledged to me that he/she/they execu	uted the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and trument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY paragraph is true and correct.	under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official sea	ıł.
Notary Public	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	то в	E COMPLETED	BY PLAN	NING STAFF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL		
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN			DATE
REZONING FILE NUM	IBER				BY
		BE COMPLET (PLEASE PR			
ADDRESS OF PROPE PROTESTED	RTYBEING 700	CAMBRE	AN DL	CAMPBEL	1. 1.A 9508
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	NUMBER(S)	412-41-	018	\	L (14 95008
REASONOFPROTES				**************************************	······································
I protest the propos	sed rezoning becau	se See Attach	ment A		
Marken .		Use separate si	heet if necess	sarv	
The property in whi	ich I own an undivid cribe property by a	ed interest of at le	ast 51%, and	on behalf of which	ch this protest is being filed,
700 CAM	BRITIN C	12-41-	CISELL OIS	, CA 95	120 B
			0:0		
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Santa Clara	County)
The undivided inter	est which I own in th	ne property descrit	oed in the sta	atement above is a	а:
Fee Int	erest (ownership)				
Lease	Leasehold interest which expires on				
Other:	(explain)				

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTEST.	ANT(\$)		
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.			
PRINTNAME JAMES WALTHAM SHANNIN	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	406.3	71-5609
ADDRESS 700 CAMBREAN DK. CAMPBE		TATE *//	ZIP CODE 9 (UU)
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE /	110
PRINTNAME Dawn Marie Shannon	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408 - 3	71-5409
ADDRESS 100 Cambrian Dr. Campbell		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized) \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		DATE 9/2	2/10
PRINT NAME /	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	·	
ADDRESS CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u></u>	
ADDRESS CITY	* ••••	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
Use separate sheet if necessary		•	

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Senta Clara) ss.
On Lot Do 100 before me, When Menney Described to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Commission # 1733376 Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Olane M. James Commission # 1733376 Notary Public Seal Olane M. James Commission # 1733376 Notary Public Notary Public
STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.
On LO, 2010 before me, Men Mondol, Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. WITNESS my hand and official seal. One of the seal of

(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO.	BE COMPLETED	BY PLANNING STAF	F
FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE
REZONING FILE NUME	3ER			DI
	TO		ED BY APPLICANT RINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED	8	70 Sydna	or Dr	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	` '	112-41-0	14-00	
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the propos		ause See Attach		
		Use separate s	heetifnecessary	
	ribe property by	y address and Asse	ssor's Parcel Number)	f which this protest is being filed,
	412-4	11-014-0	٥	
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Santa C	Clara County)
Fee Inte	erest (ownership) nold interest whic	ch expires on	bed in the statement abo	
	- 3 5 + 1 -			

SIGNATURE(S) OF	PROTESTA	NT(S)		
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.				
PRININAME Keger L. Dornbush		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	608/3	77-8458
ADDRESS 870 Sudnor Dr	Campbel	ST \	ÀTE	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 9/2	3/10
PRINTHAME HED. Dornbush		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS 870 Sudnor Dra	Campbel	II CA	TATE	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Salutte () () ornhus	h		DATE 9/2	13/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	a and the second	
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	<u> </u>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	<u></u>		DATE	
Use separate sh	eetifnecessary			

COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.
On 9-23-10 before me, James V. Delang, Notary Public, personally appeared Roger L. Dornbush + Rabette D. Dornbush, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. JAMES V. DELONG COMM. #1754619 NOTARY PUBLIC - CALIFORNIA OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY OF COMM. EXPIRES JUNE 30, 2011 C
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss. COUNTY OF)
On
person(s) acted, executed the instrument. I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal.
(Seal) Notary Public

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

		O BE COMPLETED B	Y PLANNING	STAFF	
FILENUME		D	OUN CIL ISTRICT	DATE	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		ВУ	
REZONING	FILENUMBER				
		TO BE COMPLETEI (PLEASE PRIN		ANT:	
PROTESTE	OF PROPERTY BEING D	UORMANDC		campbell	CA
		114-02-0	<u> 214</u>		
REASON C	FPROTEST the proposed rezoning	pecause_See Attachm	ent A		
<u></u>		Use separate she	et if necessary		
The pro	ed at: (describe proper	individed interest of at leasity by address and Assess	or's Parcel Num	shalf of which this protest is liber)	s being filed,
	4	14-02-	014		
and is r	now zoned R1-8		District. (in Sa	nta Clara County)	11. 1 100
The und	ivided interest which I o	wn in the property describe	ed in the statemer	nt above is a:	•
	Fee Interest (owners	ship)	`		
[Leasehold interest	which expires on			
. [Other: (explain)				
				<u> </u>	

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

MICHAEL LAUPP	DAYTIME 408 377-9209
ADDRESS NORMANDY DR CAN	MDQU (4 10000
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE (127/10
PRINTNAME LAUPP	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#408 924 3632
ADDRESS CHYANOL DR CAM	Obell CA 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE 9, 27.10
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELF:PHONE#
ADDRESS CITY	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS CITY	نسبب المراجع
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS CITY	Y STATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS CITY	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
Use separate sheet if nec	essary

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF SAMA CUMA) ss.)
On	e in his/her/their authorized capacity(les), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the la paragraph is true and correct.	M S LUCIO
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County MyComm. Exores May 22, 2012
Notary Public	(Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF) ss.) ,
On before me,	, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of
satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the san that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and ne in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laparagraph is true and correct.	aws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
Notary Public	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

.....

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO	BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING ST	TAFF
TLENUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE
REZONING FI	LE NUMBER) LAW	BY
	T(O BE COMPLETED BY APPLICA (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	NT
ADDRESS OF PROTESTED	PROPERTYBEING	170 NormANDI DI	Rive
ASSESSOR'S	PARCELNUMBER(S)	414-02-0	_
REASONOFF		111	
		C 1 1 1 1	
	e proposed rezoning beca	ause See Attachment A	
	e proposed rezoning beca	ause See Attachment A	
	e proposed rezoning beca	ause See Attachment A	
	e proposed rezoning beca	Use separate sheet if necessary	
I protest the	rty in which I own an undi	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on beha	alf of which this protest is being filed,
I protest the	rty in which I own an undi at: (describe property b	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on behavy address and Assessor's Parcel Number	er)
I protest the	rty in which I own an undi	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on behavy address and Assessor's Parcel Number	alf of which this protest is being filed, er)
I protest the	rty in which I own an undi at: (describe property b	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on behavy address and Assessor's Parcel Number	er)
The proper is situated	rty in which I own an undir at: (describe property b 70 Nov MAN	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on beha by address and Assessor's Parcel Numb	er) 414-02-055
The proper is situated	rty in which I own an undir at: (describe property by 70 Nov MAN	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on behavy address and Assessor's Parcel Number	er) 414-02-055
The proper is situated and is now	rty in which I own an undir at: (describe property by 70 Nov MAN w zoned R1-8	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on beha by address and Assessor's Parcel Numb	er) 4/4 - 02 - 055 ta Clara County)
The proper is situated and is now	rty in which I own an undir at: (describe property by 70 Nov MAN w zoned R1-8	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on beha by address and Assessor's Parcel Number District. (in Sant	er) 4/4 - 02 - 055 ta Clara County)
The proper is situated and is now	rty in which I own an undir at: (describe property by 70 Nov MAN w zoned R1-8 ded interest which I own in	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on behavior address and Assessor's Parcel Number District. (in Santante property described in the statement	er) 4/4 - 02 - 055 ta Clara County)
The proper is situated and is now	rty in which I own an undir at: (describe property by 70 Nov MAN v zoned R1-8 ded interest which I own in Fee Interest (ownership)	Use separate sheet if necessary ivided interest of at least 51%, and on beha by address and Assessor's Parcel Number District. (in Sant	ta Clara County) above is a:

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT, NAME (1) Am (Vez		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u> 377 -</u>	6588
ADDRESS 1170 NOVIMANDITORINE	CITY	20 (SI	ATE A _	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Novarized)			DATE) /2	5/2010
PRINTNAME RINE / RAMINE	7	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	377	-6188
ADDRESS/170 Norman)'/ Drive	CITY	1/2e// (S)	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 25	horo
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	7	
ADDRESS	CITY	Si	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	<u></u>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	<u> </u>	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate shee	et if necessary	f		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF Sonda Olara ss. ss.
On Son 25, 20/1) before me, Charles Rances who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Commission # 1733376 Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Olane M. James Commission # 1733376 Notary Public Notary Public
STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF Surfa Clara) ss.
On 15,3010 before me, Will Motary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE CO	MPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL	Berner	DATE
REZONING FILE NUMI	BER	PLAN		BY
			ED BY APPLICANT	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED	1184	Nor	rmandy Dr	Campbell 9500x
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	MUMBER(S) 414(02051	and a	
REASON OF PROTEST	red rezoning because	See Attach	ment A	
	U	se separate s	sheet if necessary	
The property in whi	ch I own an undivided in	terest of at le	east 51%, and on behalf of whitesor's Parcel Number)	ch this protest is being filed,
414	102054 1184 NO	~mandu	ρ.	
and is now zoned	1184 Noi R1-8		District. (in Santa Clare	
Fee Int	erest (ownership) nold interest which expir	es on	ibed in the statement above is	a:

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

		·		
PRINTNAME GUSan J. Rhodes		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS 1184 NOrmand V Dr.	Campo	ell 8	TATE	21PCODE 25008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Susau Rhode	A 1		DATE	22/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		_	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	L	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sh	neet if necessar	/		

STATE OF CALIFO	^ ^)		
COUNTY OF	onla Clara) ss.)		
acknowledged to n that by his/her/thei	before me, Length of the person(s) whose name that he/she/they executed their signature(s) on the instrument ecuted the instrument.	me(s) is/are sub e same in his/he	r/their authorized ca	on the basis of instrument and pacity(ies), and
I certify under PE paragraph is true a	NALTY OF PERJURY under t	he laws of the	State of California	that the foregoing
WITNESS I	my hand and official seal. Line Mary Public Otary Public	,	(Seal)	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - Californic Santa Clara County My Comm. Expres Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALIFO	DRNIA)) ss.		
COUNTY OF)		
acknowledged to m that by his/her/thei	ce-to be the person(s) whose name that he/she/they executed the r signature(s) on the instrument	me(s) is/are sub e same in his/he	r/their authorized ca	on the basis of instrument and pacity(ies), and
I certify under PE	ecuted the instrument. NALTY OF PERJURY under the second to the second	he laws of the	State of California	that the foregoing
paragraph is true a	na correct.			
WITNESS 1	my hand and official seal.			
ē			(Seal)	
No	otary Public			

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TC	BE COMPLETED	BY PLANNING	STAFF	
FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT		
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE	
REZONING FILE NUMI	BER	1 mix		BY	
		TO BE COMPLET (PLEASE PR	ED BY APPLIC	CANT	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED	RTYBEING	1197 NOrm	andy Dr.		
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	.NUMBER(S)	414 020	16		
REASON OF PROTEST	sed rezoning be	cause See Attach			
		Use separate s	heet if necessary		
is situated at: (desc 		by address and Asse	ssor's Parcel Nu		filed,
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in S	anta Clara County)	
FeeInt	terest (ownershi	n in the property descri ip) nich expires on		ent above is a:	
Other:	(explain)				

SIGNATURE(S) OF I	PROTESTA	ANT(S)				
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.						
PRINTNAME Adam Weinsteln		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-	712-2548		
ADDRESS 197 Normandy Dr. SIGNATURE (Notarized)	CITY	ST	ATE /	ZIPCODE りちひらと		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		A TOTAL PARTY OF THE PARTY OF T	DATE 9/2	22/10		
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#				
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE			
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
ADDRESS	CITY	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ATE	ZIPCODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE			
PRINTNAME	The state of the s	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#				
ADDRESS	CITY	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	TATE	ZIPCODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE			
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	·			
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE			
PRINTNAME	*****	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#				
ADDRESS	СПҮ		ATE	ZIPCODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE			
Use separate shee	t if necessary					

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

		. TO .	BE COMPLETED BY PI	ANNING STAFF			
	FILENUMBER		COUN DISTR		0.475		
	QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE		
	REZONING FILE	NUMBER			DI		
		T(D BE COMPLETED B (PLEASE PRINT OF				
*	ADDRESS OF PR PROTESTED	1200 NOK	emandy DR.	Campbel	4CA		
XF	ASSESSOR'S PAF	CELNUMBER(S)	4-02-05	3-00 <u> </u>			
,	REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A						
	70	liala laa anadi	Use separate sheet if a		ch this protest is being filed,		
٠.	is situated at:	(describe property by ') ひ ∇0と γγ	y address and Assessor's	Parcel Number)	on this protection being most,		
×	Cc	mpbell	Ca 95008		0.05		
				414-02	<u> </u>		
	and is now zo	oned R1-8	Dis	rict. (in Santa Clar	a County)		
	The undivided	l interest which I own i	n the property described in	the statement above is	: a:		
P	□ F	ee Interest (ownership)	•				
	ا 🗋 ـ	easehold interest whic	ch expires on				
	□ c	Other: (explain)					

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

<u> </u>				
PRINTNAME Patricia Garcia		DAYTIME TELEPHONI		9-6402
ADDRESS 1200 NORMANDY Dr.	CITY	mphell	STATE	ZIP CODE 95001
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		1 , , ,	DATE	2/25/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHON	E#	•
ADDRESS	CITY		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONI	E#	
ADDRESS	СПУ		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHON	E#	
ADDRESS .	CITY		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		_	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHON	E#	
ADDRESS	CITY		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHON	E#	100
ADDRESS	СПҮ		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sheet	if necessa	ıry		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) 55.
On Sto 25, 2710 before me, Ward satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(sacknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the sar that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.	Ne in his/her/their authorized canacity/ies) and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laparagraph is true and correct.	aws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Leve M James Notary Public	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF)) ss.)
on before me, satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s) acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.	e in his/her/their authorized canacity/ias) and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the lar paragraph is true and correct.	ws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
Notary Public	(Seal)



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE	COMPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE
REZONING FILE NUME	BER	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		D1
	TO B	国际的特殊的 企业的包含的企业	ED BY APPLICANT IINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED	RTYBEING Q	633 S	. Bascom Ave	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	NUMBER(S)	12-4/-)34	
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the propos	red rezoning because	See Attach	ment A	
		Use separate s	heet if necessary	
is situated at: (desc	ch I own an undivide cribe property by ad 2033 ち	dress and Asse	east 51%, and on behalf of whitesor's Parcel Number)	ich this protest is being filed,
	412-4	1-034	*	
and is now zoned	CN		District. (in Santa Clar	a County)
The undivided inter	est which I own in the	property descri	ibed in the statement above is	: a:
Fee Inte	erest (ownership)			
	nold interest which explain)		Limited Parta	vershp Valneiship

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME Rande M'Oiveer		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		17-2900)
ADDRESS 906 Sweet brian Qu	CITY Campbe		TATE <i>f</i>	ZIP CODE 45008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) M. Quar	<u> </u>	·,	DATE	110
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		,
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	,	
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sh	eet if necessar	у		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF GANTA CUMA) ss.)
satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whosacknowledged to me that he/she/they execute	Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of se name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and at the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and ament the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
paragraph is true and correct.	der the laws of the State of California that the foregoing M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Notary Public	Notary Public - California & Santa Ciara County MyComm. Expres May 22, 2012 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.
COUNTY OF	,
acknowledged to me that he/she/they execute	, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of se name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and ed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and ament the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY un paragraph is true and correct.	der the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
Notary Public	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. Prezoning Does Not Accommodate Many Existing Commercial Uses: Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning and actual uses. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning and/or what uses currently exist. From my understanding, the proposed CN zoning district does not appear to accommodate existing commercial uses within Cambrian 36 and would require costly permitting for any expansion of existing legal uses. Staff also has not provided a comparison of zoning regulations such as restrictions on floor area ratios and densities, etc. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate how the Prezoning will affect my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE CO	MPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		BY
REZONING FILE NUME	BER	·		
			ED BY APPLICANT RINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED	RTYBEING 2633	5 .1	Bascom Are	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	NUMBER(S) 4/2	41-	042	
REASON OF PROTEST	ed rezoning because	See Attach	nment A	
	U	se separate :	sheet if necessary	
The property in whi	cribe property by addre	ess and Ass	east 51%, and on behalf of whi essor's Parcel Number)	•
263=	1 6	tve	4412-41-043	<u> </u>
Wa:	s zoned K	<u> </u>		
and is now zoned	CN		District. (in Santa Clar	a County)
The undivided inter	est which I own in the p	roperty desc	ribed in the statement above is	a:
Fee Inf	terest (ownership)			
[hold interest which expi			
Other:	(explain) McQu Randee M	ween hi	mited Partpersh - Sect/Tureasun	of Parlnership

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an exsement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTELLANCE		DAYTIME		
PRINTHAME Rander M'Queen		TELEPHONE#		7-2900
ADDRESS 906 Sweet brian	CITY Câmpb	oll C	ATE C	ZIP CODE 25208
SIGNATURE (Notarized) M Queen			DATE 1/22	110
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	Sì	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINT NAME .		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sh	eet if necessar	у		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF) ss.)
On 912/2016 before me, 45. U	Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of
acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the	me(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and e same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and at the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under to paragraph is true and correct.	the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County MyComm. Bodies May 22, 2012
Notary Public	(Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF)) ss.)
On before me,	, Notary Public, personally appeared
acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the	ame(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and ne same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and nt the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under paragraph is true and correct.	the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
	(Seal)
Motory Public	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. Prezoning Does Not Accommodate Many Existing Commercial Uses; Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning and actual uses. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning and/or what uses currently exist. From my understanding, the proposed CN zoning district does not appear to accommodate existing commercial uses within Cambrian 36 and would require costly permitting for any expansion of existing legal uses. Staff also has not provided a comparison of zoning regulations such as restrictions on floor area ratios and densities, etc. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate how the Prezoning will affect my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

nemas eres i ser Kabasa i salah da	ТО	BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING S	TAFF
FILENUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL	DATE
		PLAN	BY
REZONING FILE NU	IMBER		
	T	TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICA (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	NT E E
ADDRESS OF PROP PROTESTED	PERTYBEING X	35 SWEETBRAR DRUC	AMPBELL CA 95008
AȘSESSOR'S PARC	ELNUMBER(S)	OU CHALLISTING THE	
412-40-0 REASON OF PROTE			All Parties and All Parties an
		cause See Attachment A	
, p. 0.000	,		
<u></u>			
		Use separate sheet if necessary	
is situated at: (d	escribe property i	divided interest of at least 51%, and on beh by address and Assessor's Parcel Numb	oer)
835 Su	FETBRIAR	DR. CAMPBELL, CA	15008
PARCEL	AH19-40-	-028	
-1- 11-0	//		
and is now zon	ed R1-8	District. (in San	ta Clara County)
The undivided in	terest which I own	in the property described in the statement	t above is a:
∑ Fee	Interest (ownershi	ip)	
Lea	sehold interest wh	nich expires on	
Oth	er:(explain)		

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME SUSAN PUTZ				628-4566
ADDRESS 835 SWEETBRIAR DR	CITY CAMPI	3 <u>EU</u> 6	TATE	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE SIE/	25.2010
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		1
ADDRESS	СПҮ		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	,
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sheet	if necessary	1		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)			
COUNTY OF Saula	Clara) ss.)			
on Sept 25, 2010 Section / 6 for satisfactory evidence to be to acknowledged to me that he that by his/her/their signature person(s) acted, executed the	e/she/they executed the are(s) on the instrume	name(s) is/are sub he same in his/he	scribed to the w r/their authorize	d capacity(ies), and	
I certify under PENALTY paragraph is true and corre		the laws of the	State of Califor	nia that the foregoing	
WITNESS my hand Classe Notary Pub	on James	2	(Seal)	Commission Notary Public	ra County
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.)			
On	before me,			ic, personally appeared me on the basis of	
satisfactory evidence-to be t acknowledged to me that he that by his/her/their signatu person(s) acted, executed th	e/she/they executed the ere(s) on the instrumen	name(s) is/are sub he same in his/he	scribed to the w r/their authorize	ithin instrument and discapacity(ies), and	
I certify under PENALTY paragraph is true and corre	•	the laws of the	State of Califor	nia that the foregoing	
WITNESS my hand	and official seal.				
	olic		(Seal)		
110141114					

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED	TO TYBEING 145 NORI	(PLEASE PR	COUNCIL DISTRICT ED BY APPLICAN INT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED ASSESSOR'S PARCELIA PROSESTED	TYBEING 945 NORI	PLAN BE COMPLET (PLEASE PR	INT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED ASSESSOR'S PARCELL BEASON OF PROTEST	TO TYBEING 945 Nori	(PLEASE PR	INT OR TYPE)	
PROTESTED ASSESSOR'S PARCELI BEASON OF PROTEST	TYBEING 945 NORI	(PLEASE PR	INT OR TYPE)	
PROTESTED ASSESSOR'S PARCELI PRASON OF PROTEST	945 NORI			
ASSESSOR'S PARCELI	VIMBER(S)			
REASON OF PROTEST	· • 1			
I protest the propose				
I brotoor trio broboot	ed rezoning becau	se See Attach	ment A	
			heet if necessary_	
The property in which is situated at: (desc	ch I own an undivid	led interest of at leaddress and Asse	east 51%, and on beha essor's Parcel Numbe	If of which this protest is being filed er)
91	45 NOR	IN CT		
	412 - 30	9-033	-06	
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Sant	a Clara County)
The undivided inter	est which I own in t	the property descr	ibed in the statement a	above is a:
▼ FeeInt	erest (ownership)			
Leasel	old interest which	expires on		
Other:	(explain)			
	·			

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

		DAYTIME	2 / 2	
PRINTNAME RAMEN Rap		TELEPHONE#	369-	
ADDRESS 945 NOBIN CT	CITY	Bell SI	ATE	ZIPCODE 9,5006
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	7	:	DATE $9/$	27/2010
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S ⁻	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		_	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate shee	t if necessar	/		

STATE OF CALIFORN)			
COUNTY OF Jan	ta Clara)	SS.		
acknowledged to me th	before me, before me, be the person(s) whose at he/she/they executed nature(s) on the instrumed the instrument.	the same in	.nis/per/uyeir au	monzeu capacity(<i>ys),</i> and
paragraph is true and o	nand and official seal.	er the laws	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	MARIA PEPPER COMM. #18132: Notary Public · Califo Santa Clara Count y Comm. Expires Sep. 16	B5 N roia O
STATE OF CALIFORN)	ss.		
satisfactory evidence-to acknowledged to me th that by his/her/their sig	before me, be the person(s) whose at he/she/they executed mature(s) on the instrum	name(s) is/	who pro are subscribed t his/her/their au	oved to me on the b o the within instru- uthorized capacity(asis of ment and ies), and
I certify under PENAl paragraph is true and o	LTY OF PERJURY unde	er the laws	of the State of	California that the	e foregoing
WITNESS my l	nand and official seal.				
Notary	Public		(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. <u>Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property</u> Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	то	BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING	STAFF
FILENUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL	DATE
REZONING FILE	JI IMRER	PLAN	BY
nezowing rice:	NOMBER		
eren fransk er bla Mansk eleger German fræfik	7	D BE COMPLETED BY APPLI (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	CANT
ADDRESS OF PROTESTED	OPERTY BEING	946 Norin C	- Compbell CA 9500
ASSESSOR'S PAF	RCELNUMBER(S)	412-39-038	
REASON OF PRO			
I protest the pr	oposed rezoning bec	ause See Attachment A	
<u> </u>			
		Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property is	n which I own an undi	vided interest of at least 51%, and on I	behalf of which this protest is being filed,
is situated at: (describe property b ムリレ	y address and Assessor's Parcel Nu	moer,
	(()	412-29-028	-00 CA 95008
		(12 31 030	
	, D1 0	District (in C	Canta Clara County)
and is now zo	oned VI-9	District. (in S	oania Ciara County)
The undivided	interest which I own i	n the property described in the statem	nent above is a:
⊠. F	ee Interest (ownership)	
	easehold interest which	ch expires on	
	ther: (evnlain)		
	ины (ехріані)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<u></u> ,			

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

<u> </u>					
PRINTNAME Dowid	I. Sous	jord	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		410-8941
ADDRESS 946 Nor	in ct	Campbell	ST.	ATEC (A)	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	I. Sous in ct	wol		DATE 9	-25-2010
PRINTNAME	0 1		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS		СПҮ	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINTNAME			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS		CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINTNAME			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS		CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINTNAME			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS		CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	_:
PRINTNAME			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS		CITY	<u> </u>	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
	Use separa	ite sheet if necessary			
	Osasahara	пе энееги песеззагу			

state of California County of Saxfa Ola	na) ss.		
On Slot 25, 2010 before Naved Ognacio satisfactory evidence-to be the persor acknowledged to me that he/she/they that by his/her/their signature(s) on the person(s) acted, executed the instrument of the person of	executed the same the instrument the nent.	wh is/are-subscrine in his/her/th person(g), or the	to proved to n bed to the wil eir authorized he entity upor	thin instrument and I capacity(ies), and n behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJ paragraph is true and correct.	UKY under the la	aws of the Stat	te of Californ	ia that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and office Mand Motary Public	rial seal.		(Seal)	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - Californi Santa Clara County My Comm, Expires Apr 20, 201
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.)		
On before satisfactory evidence-to be the person acknowledged to me that he/she/they that by his/her/their signature(s) on the person(s) acted, executed the instrum	n(s) whose name(s) vexecuted the same the instrument the	wh.) is/are subscril ie in his/her/the	o proved to m bed to the wit eir authorized	capacity(ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJI paragraph is true and correct.		ws of the Stat	e of Californ	ia that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and offic	ial seal.			
Notary Public			(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

REZONING FILENUMBER TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 955 Novin C+ Camplel Cq, 95068 ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 412-39-034 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary		TO I	BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING ST	AFF
REZONING FILE NUMBER TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 955 Novin C+ Camphell Cq, 9508 ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER(S) 412-39-034 REASONOF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 455 Novin C+ Camphell Cq, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	FILENUMBER			
TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 955 Novin C+ Camphell Cq, 95008 ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 412-39-034 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided Interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955 Novin C+ Camphel Ca, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	QUAD#	ZONING		DATE
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 955 Novin C+ Camphell Cq, 95008 ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 412-39-034 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955			PLAN	BY
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 955 Novin Ct Campbell Cq, 9508 ASSESSOR'S PARCELNUMBER(S) 412-39-034 REASONOF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955 Novin Ct Campbell Cq, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	REZONING FILE	NUMBER		
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 955 Novin C+ Campbel Cq, 95008 ASSESSORS PARCELNUMBER(s) 412-39-034 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955 Novin C+ Campbel Cq, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on		TO		NT
ASSESSOR'S PARCELNUMBER(S) H 12-39-034 REASONOF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 455 Nov'in (+ Campbell Ca, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	ADDRESS OF PI	ROPERTYBEING		
REASONOFPROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955 Norin (+ Campbel Cq, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	PROTESTED C	155 Noviv	ict Campbe	11 Cq, 45008
I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 455 Novin (+ Campbell Ca, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on			1	
Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955 Nor's (+ Campbell Ca, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on				
Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955 Nor's (+ Campbell Ca, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	I protest the p	proposed rezoning beca	ause See Attachment A	-
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955 Novin (+ Campbell Cq, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955 Novin (+ Campbell Cq, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on				
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being file is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 955 Novin (+ Campbell Cq, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on			Use separate sheet if necessary	
is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 455 Novin (+ Campbell Ca, 95008 412-39-034 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	The property	in which I own an undiv	rided interest of at least 51%, and on beha	If of which this protest is being fil
and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	ic cituated at:	(deceribe property hi	raddrage and Accasent's Parcel Number	or)
and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	955	Norin Ct	Campbell (4, 45008
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on			412-39-034	
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on				
Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	and is now a	coned R1-8	District. (in Sant	a Clara County)
Leasehold interest which expires on	The undivide	d interest which I own ir	the property described in the statement (above is a:
Leasehold interest which expires on		Fee Interest (ownership)		
Other: (explain)		_easehold interest whic	h expires on	
		Other: (explain)		

SIGNATURE (Notarized)

SIGNATURE	(S) OF PROTESTA	NT(S)		
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners which such protest is filed, such interest being not remaining term of ten years or longer shall be dee an eligible protest site is a legal entitiy other than a duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. Whe petition shall be signed by the duly authorized offi members of the association.	merely an easement. A med an "owner" for purp a person or persons, the en such legal entity is a h	tenant under a poses of this pro protest petition nomeowner's as	lease which test. When a shall be s sociation,	h has a n the owner of signed by the the protest
PRINTNAME TOMEZ		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	11401	559-6259
ADDRESS 955 Novin Ct	CO MA OLO		ATE	ZIPCODE (5008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE / -	7-16
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	·	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	, ,,,,,,,
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		·
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ		ATE	ZIPCODE

Use separate sheet if necessary

DATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.)
acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the	Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of me(s) is/a/e subscribed to the within instrument and e same in h/s/her/their authorized capacity(i/s), and the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
paragraph is true and correct.	MARIA PEPPER COMM. #1813285
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Notary Public	Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Sep. 16, 2012 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.)
	, Notary Public, personally appeared , who proved to me on the basis of
acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the	ne(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the paragraph is true and correct.	ne laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
Notary Public	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

كبران كشائد فينبون وبير والتنفاء والمحادث			D BY PLANNING		
FILENUMBER	ZONING	GENERA PLAN	COUNCIL DISTRICT	ŀ	DATE
REZONING FILENUM	MBER				
ASSESSOR'S PARCE - しし PEASON OF PROTES	ERTYBEING SCHOOL NO. LINUMBER(S) ST O.3	in は.		<u>\\</u>	, 9500S
بملم/ يقم لمستمرينات سا	aavika nyanarii/ l	livided interest of a	eedeenre Parcei Niji	moen	this protest is being fil
بملم/ يقم لمستمرينات سا	aavika nyanarii/ l	livided interest of a	at least 51%, and on b	moen	
is situated at: (de	scribe property is NOCic	livided interest of a by address and A	at least 51%, and on b		95008

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entitly other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408)1.2	:9-29SS
Aaron C. Ewing		LLLFITUNE#	ATE	ZIPCODE
ADDRESS SU NOTIN CX.	Comb po	ા	TATE CA	22008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 9 / 8	27/10
DONTNAME		DAYTIME		
PRINTNAME B. Ewing		TELEPHONE#		71·9JL
ADDRESS 156 Norin Ch. C	CITY CITY		TATE A.	ZIPCODE CSWX
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE □\ ⊋_기	110
The Bloom		DAVENIE		
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
, ´				
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME		
1 1114 114 MAIC		TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
		DAYTIME		
PRINTNAME	1	TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		······································	DATE	
and the second s				
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	÷	
ADDRESS	CITY	<u> </u>	TATE	ZIPCODE
			DATE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DAIC	
Use separat	e sheet if necessary	,		
<u>-</u>				

STATE OF CALIFO	PKNIA	}			
COUNTY OF _ 5	anta Clura)	SS.		
acknowledged to m that by his/he r/their	before me, Mich y & Aavon C. Eu re-to be the person(8) whose e that he/she/they executed r signature(s) on the instrum cuted the instrument.	the same in	his/her /their aut	thorized capacity(ies), and	
I certify under PEN paragraph is true a	NALTY OF PERJURY undend correct.	er the laws o	of the State of G	California that the foregoin	ıg
Thic	ny hand and official seal. Lulle Outon tary Public	awig		MICHELLE ANTONOWICZ Commission # 1851839 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Jun 1, 2013	THE BUNDANCE OF
STATE OF CALIFO	RNIA)	ss.		
COUNTY OF		ý	551	1	
On	before me,			y Public, personally appear ved to me on the basis of	ed
acknowledged to m that by his/her/their	e-to be the person(s) whose e that he/she/they executed signature(s) on the instrun cuted the instrument.	the same in	his/her/their aut	thorized capacity(ies), and	
I certify under PEN paragraph is true as	NALTY OF PERJURY unde	er the laws o	of the State of C	California that the foregoin	ıg
WITNESS n	ny hand and official seal.				
Noi	tary Public		(S	eal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Bullding and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO	BE COMPLETED BY PL	ANNING STAFF	
FILENUMBER		COUNC		
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE
REZONING FILE NUM	MBER			
		O BE COMPLETED BY (PLEASE PRINT OR		
ADDRESS OF PROPE PROTESTED	ERTYBEING (6 NORIN CT		
ASSESSOR'S PARCE	LINUMBERIO	112-39-036	,	
REASON OF PROTES I protest the propo		eause See Attachment A	A	
		Use separate sheet if n	ecessary	
is situated at: (des	scribe property b	ivided interest of at least 51% by address and Assessor's F CAMP BELL, (- 036	Parcel Number)	
and is now zoned		Distr		
The undivided inte	erest which I own	in the property described in t	ne statement above is	a:
☐ Feelr	nterest (ownership	o)		
harranno de la constanta de la		ch expires on		
Other	r:(explain) IO OCHASKA	RUSTE OF B FAINTLY TRE	LENDETH R	E CAROL V.
				

SIGNATURE(S) OF F	PROTESTA	NT(S)		
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an und which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "ov an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person of duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such leg petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of sumembers of the association.	easement. A vner" for purp r persons, the al entity is a t	tenant under a poses of this pro e protest petition nomeowner's as	lease whicl test. When I shall be s sociation, t	n has a I the owner of igned by the he protest
PRINTNAME KENNSTH R. PROCHAZKI	4	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408 3	フフッチゲンド
ADDRESS 966 NORIN CT CA	CITY WARELL		ATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 9/	22/00
PRINTNAME CAROL V PROCHAZKA		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408 37	7-4525
ADDRESS 966 NORIN OF O	CITY 4mPBE4	S	TATE	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Noterized)	AND THE REAL PROPERTY AND THE PARTY AND THE		DATE	2-10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	. E \$ 1. Z. God	
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	****		DATE	·
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE .	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	1	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sheet	ifnecessary	.,		

STATE OF CALI	FORNIA)	
COUNTY OF _	ANTA CLAMA) ss.)	
acknowledged to that by his/her/the	nce-to be the person(s) whose na me that he/she/they executed th	Notary Public, personally Same in the subscribed to the within instrument same in his/her/fher authorized capacity(ieses the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of within the person (s).	ent and s), and
I certify under P paragraph is true		ne laws of the State of California that the fo	oregoing
WITNESS	S my hand and official seal.	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - Californi Santa Clara County MyComm. Bores May 22, 201 (Seal)	a NA
Ž.	lotáry Public		
STATE OF CALIF	ORNIA)	
COUNTY OF) ss.)	
On	before me,	, Notary Public, personally , who proved to me on the basi	
acknowledged to that by his/her/the	me that he/she/they executed the	ne(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrume same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies) the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of wh	nt and), and
I certify under Pl paragraph is true		ne laws of the State of California that the fo	oregoing
WITNESS	my hand and official seal.		
N	otary Public	(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire